<u>REMARKS</u>

Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1, 19 and 23 have been amended. Support for the claim amendments may be found in the specification and claims as originally filed.   No new matter has been added.   Claims 8-18 and 24-32 were previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer as being drawn to non-elected inventions.

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-7 and 19-23 will be pending in the present application, with claims 1, 19 and 23 being independent.

1.   <u>CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103</u>

A.   **Rejections Based on Toll and Iwata**

Claims 1, 19 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Toll (U.S. Patent 6,430,526) in view of Iwata (U.S. Patent 6,385,201).   Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Toll discloses a topology engine 37 that provides a high-level API by which an application 20 is able to configure and control electronic components 65 (see col. 2, lines 29-31; Figure 1).   The topology engine 37 includes parser 30 that generates topology data 40 by processing topology descriptions, conforming to a topology description language, for an electronic environment 60 and the electronic components 65 (see col. 2, lines 36-46).

However, Toll fails to disclose or suggest the elements of <u>in response to receiving the plurality of media parameters</u>, creating by a topology application programming interface a topology interface capable of being passed to a media processor as an extensible symbolic representation of an intended media flow based on at least one of the received media parameters, as included in amended claim 1. Additionally, Toll fails to disclose or suggest the elements of <u>in response to receiving</u>

the first and second parameter, creating by a segment topology node application programming interface the segment topology node interface as part of a topology that is incapable of alteration of input and output nodes to the segment topology node, the segment topology node being separately identifiable, as included in amended claim 19. Furthermore, Toll fails to disclose or suggest the elements of in response to receiving the media processor, timeline and topology parameters, enabling by an application programming interface a multimedia processing function via an extensible symbolic abstraction of media objects related to one or more of the media processor parameter, the timeline parameter and the topology parameter, as included in amended claim 23. Iwata fails to cure this defect.

Iwata discloses aggregation of links between nodes of the same peer group into a logical link and aggregation of the topology of border nodes of a child peer group into a logical star topology (see col. 1, lines 7-11). The Office Action cites Iwata in asserting that Iwata teaches receiving various parameters. However, even if for argument sake Iwata discloses receiving various parameters, which applicants do not concede, the Office Action fails to establish that Iwata discloses or suggests the elements of in response to receiving the plurality of media parameters, creating by a topology application programming interface a topology interface capable of being passed to a media processor as an extensible symbolic representation of an intended media flow based on at least one of the received media parameters, as included in amended claim 1. Additionally, Iwata fails to disclose or suggest the elements of in response to receiving the first and second parameter, creating by a segment topology node application programming interface the segment topology node interface as part of a topology that is incapable of alteration of input and output nodes to the segment topology node, the segment topology node being separately identifiable, as included in amended claim 19. Furthermore, Iwata fails to disclose or suggest the elements of in response to receiving the media processor, timeline and topology parameters, enabling by an application programming interface a multimedia processing function via an

extensible symbolic abstraction of media objects related to one or more of the media processor parameter, the timeline parameter and the topology parameter, as included in amended claim 23.

Therefore, since Toll and Iwata, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the elements of claims 1, 19 and 23, these claims are allowable.

For at least the above reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 19 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are respectfully requested.

B.   Rejections Based on Toll, Iwata and Pogue Jr.

Claims 2-7 and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Toll in view of Iwata and further in view of Pogue Jr. (U.S. Patent 5,995,512). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

As discussed above, Toll and Iwata, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the elements of independent claims 1 and 19. Pogue Jr. fails to cure this defect.

Pogue, Jr. discloses a multimedia data network that includes a fiber optic data bus arranged in a star topology configuration (see abstract; col. 10, lines 15-20). The data network may be implemented in a variety of environments that require electronic communications between or among different pieces of hardware devices and equipment, or nodes in the network (see col. 6, line 65 – col. 7, line 4; col. 9, line 64 – col. 10, line 2; Figure 1). For example, Pogue, Jr. discloses an intelligent interface unit between each hardware node in the network and a network data bus. The intelligent interface unit is described as a hardware component that includes physical connections for coupling to the data bus, connections for coupling to input and output ports of a hardware node, transducers and an interface circuit (see col. 1, line 67 – col. 2, line 7). Pogue, Jr. focuses on the physical layer and design of the topology of the network.

However, Pogue, Jr. is completely silent as to the elements of <u>in response to receiving the plurality of media parameters</u>, creating by a topology application

programming interface a topology interface capable of being passed to a media processor as an extensible symbolic representation of an intended media flow based on at least one of the received media parameters, as included in amended claim 1. Additionally, Pogue, Jr. fails to disclose or suggest the elements of <u>in response to receiving the first and second parameter</u>, creating by a segment topology node application programming interface the segment topology node interface as part of a topology that is incapable of alteration of input and output nodes to the segment topology node, the segment topology node being separately identifiable, as included in amended claim 19.

Therefore, since Toll, Iwata and Pogue Jr., alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the elements of claims 1 and 19, these claims are allowable.

Claims 2–7 depend from claim 1. Claims 20–22 depend from claim 19. As discussed above, claims 1 and 19 are allowable. For at least this reason, and the features recited therein, claims 2–7 and 20–22 are also allowable.

Additionally, the Office Action on page 9 asserts that Pogue Jr. discloses the elements of dependent claim 21 (citing col. 15, lines 10-13, wherein the "plus flag" is interpreted as a dirty flag). However, Pogue Jr. merely recites:

> The nine-bit-symbols are converted to eight-bit data bytes plus flags then sent to a data interface 92 where the data may be communicated to an external node device (see col. 15, lines 10-13).

Nothing in Pogue Jr. indicates that the "plus flags" language disclosed therein refers to a dirty flag. Furthermore, contrary to the assertions in the Office Action, Pogue Jr. fails to disclose or suggest, at the sections cited by the Office Action or elsewhere, the elements of wherein the IsDirty and the SetDirty commands relate to a dirty flag on the topology that is <u>inside the segment topology node to determine whether the topology requires resolving</u>, as included in claim 21.

Furthermore, the Office Action on page 10 asserts that Pogue Jr. discloses the elements of dependent claim 22 (citing col. 9, lines 2-13, wherein the GetActualOutputNode command and the GetActualInputNode command are interpreted as parameters/functions that implement "certain actions"). However, Pogue Jr. merely recites:

> The configuration of an IC can include a variety of parameters and/or functions. For example, the IC 64 may be electronically configured to adapt to the timing and data requirements of the node interface outputs to the particular node component. The IC 64 includes a data memory capable of receiving and holding data received from the high speed network at the network data rate, then outputting that data to the IC's node interface at the whatever rate is compatible with the node. Other configuration parameters can include rather fundamental communication information such as the time slots that are available on the network for that node to transmit or receive data. Providing this type of configuration information for an individual node IC 64 can be performed either locally or remotely (see col. 9, lines 1-15).

Therefore, Pogue Jr. discloses that the configuration of an IC can include a variety of parameters and/or functions. Even if the parameters and/or functions disclosed in Pogue Jr. are capable of implementing "certain actions", Pogue Jr. still fails to disclose or suggest, at the sections cited by the Office Action or elsewhere, the specific elements of wherein the GetActualOutputNode command and the GetActualInputNode command are used to <u>find a base level non-segment node connected to one of an output stream and an input stream at a predetermined index of the segment topology node</u>, as included in claim 22.

For at least the above reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-7 and 20-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are respectfully requested.

2.   CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendment and remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Based on the foregoing, applicants respectfully request that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,

Microsoft Corporation

Date: October 9, 2007   By: /Sung T. Kim/

Sung T. Kim, Reg. No.: 45,398
Attorney for Applicants
Direct telephone: (703) 647-6574
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION
(Under 37 CFR § 1.8(a)) or ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

October 9, 2007	/Kate Marochkina/
Date	Signature

	Kate Marochkina
	Name

Application Number: 10/692,639
Attorney Docket Number: 302126.02